

I can see right now all the lobby of the far left environmental extremists are going to say this is an ANWR bill. It is not an ANWR bill. Of the comprehensive bill, H.R. 4, from the House of Representatives, that passed—and that is the one we will probably go into conference with—out of 200 pages, only 2 pages talk about ANWR. That is a very minuscule part of it. It covers a lot of items. For example, we have untapped resources in the United States other than ANWR. We have some offshore opportunities, where we have tremendous reserves.

I happen to be from the State of Oklahoma. We had huge stripper well production. When we talk about stripper wells, we are talking about small wells, shallow wells that only produce 15 or fewer barrels a day.

But if you had producing today, right now, all of those stripper wells, or marginal wells that we have plugged in the last 10 years, then it would equal more oil than we are currently importing from Saudi Arabia. That shows it is out there.

Why can't they do it? They can't do it because to lift a barrel of oil out of the ground, it costs us 10 times as much in the United States in marginal production as it does in Saudi Arabia, for example. So it is not the price of the oil so much as, when they make this decision as to whether or not to explore for these marginal wells, they have to have some idea of what the price of a barrel of oil is going to be when it is ultimately produced—and that will be a period of a year. We have jumped around from \$8 to \$35 a barrel in less than a year, so how can they predict that? That has to be included in a comprehensive energy policy so we can exploit all of these opportunities.

The other day I was on a program with one of our well-respected Senators, and I made the comment almost in jest that you can't expect to run the most highly industrialized nations in the history of the world on windmills. He said, in fact, you can. He talked about this wind technology. Fine. We want to go after these other technologies and exploit other opportunities out there—hydroelectric, the sun, and the wind. But until that comes along, we have to look very seriously not just at oil and our dependency upon foreign nations but almost nuclear.

I can remember back in the 1960s when people would protest nuclear plants. Now they realize there is a serious problem with the quality of our air. A lot of those people are saying: Let's go back and reexamine nuclear energy. No. 1, it is the cheapest; No. 2, it is the cleanest; and, No. 3, it is the most readily available.

I think we should address that in a comprehensive energy policy. That is what I hope will be on the floor.

We have something that is very significant. I am sure the American peo-

ple, since the days of my going around the Nation with Don Hodel back in the 1980s, and since we went through a very large Persian Gulf war in 1990, now realize we can't be dependent upon the Middle East. That is the hotbed. That is where the problems are today. We are concerned about North Korea and Afghanistan and about many areas, but the Persian Gulf region is where there is a tremendous threat—yes, almost a terrorist threat.

I commend the majority leader for making the agreement to bring up a comprehensive bill. But I am asking him, since it is in his lap—he is totally responsible for keeping his word on this—that he bring something to the floor early enough so we can go through the process, debate it, and have amendments. Then we can go to conference with the House. They have already passed theirs way ahead of us. We can come up with an energy policy, which we have been trying to get through. The President, I am sure, will be happy and anxious to sign it. He already stated that he would this year before we adjourn.

It is something that we must do. It is something that is long overdue. But the opportunity is here today.

I feel very strongly that this is an opportunity we cannot bypass. I commend the majority leader and am anxious to see what that product looks like. I hope we are able to work on that product and get it to conference so we get an energy policy and get it signed. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:07 p.m. recessed until 2:04 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BAYH).

CHARGING OF TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CLELAND. I yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think it is clear for the record, but we wanted to make sure that the last approximately hour and a half is charged against the postcloture proceedings on the bill before the Senate. I am quite sure that is the case, but I wanted to make it clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AVIATION SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, almost exactly 1 month ago to the day this Nation was rocked by the most horrific act of terrorism ever leveled against the United States. Following the events of September 11, we resolved as a nation to work together to secure our borders and do all in our power to prevent a repeat of the kind of assault that shook this country 30 days ago. Key to the security of America is our ability to quickly put in place enhanced security measures at our airports and on our planes to ensure that our skies are safe and that Americans are no longer afraid to fly. Yet the legislation that is key to ensuring that America's aviation system is secure—the very measure that is our most direct legislative response to the hijacking of four U.S. airliners—has been stalled now for a week. This body is in agreement on many issues in this bill and we have compromised on others. It is time that we bring this critically important bill to the floor and openly debate the differences which remain.

Whether or not to "federalize" airport security personnel is an issue that still deeply divides this body. I also attended the briefing by El Al officials which the distinguished Chairman of the Commerce Committee and others have referred to throughout this debate. We are all aware of the extraordinary security measures the Israeli airline has put in place and the extraordinary success of those measures. Because of the constant threat of terrorism to Israel and the Israeli people, El Al has taken the following steps to ensure the safety of its passengers and the integrity of its operations: armed, plain-clothes, in-flight guards; extensive passenger questioning and Interpol background checks; extensive luggage inspections, both visual inspection by employees and high-tech explosive detection, including the placing of luggage and cargo in decompression chambers; and secure cockpit doors that remain locked from the inside. Since the implementation of these measures, no Israeli airline has ever been hijacked. This record speaks for itself.

In that briefing the El Al officials were asked if airport security personnel were government workers or contract workers. The response was telling. The El Al officials did not even know what contract workers are. They want government workers on the front line to enforce the tightest security measures possible. As others have pointed out, we want Secret Service, government employees to provide the greatest protection possible to the President of the United States. We want Federal law enforcement officers